



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLÄNDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. 1881.

Heft II und III.

The articles of Socin on the geography of Tūr 'Abdīn (see in Heft I Nöldeke's notice of Prym and Socin's work on the modern Aramaic dialect of this region, which is bounded on the north and northeast by the Tigris, and on the south by the Mesopotamian valley), of Klamroth on the Arabian Euclid, of Justi on the Parsi Deri dialect of Jezd (Yezd), of Bollensen on the Veda metrik, and the tone-system of the Rīg- and Sāma-Veda, of Oldenberg on the date of the new alleged Asoka inscriptions (in which he calls in question the name of the king, and declares the inscription worthless for chronological purposes), of Stickel on Oriental coins (a critical notice of Thomas's ed. of Marsden's *Numismata Orientalia*, London, 1874, and of the *International Numismata Orientalia*, 1875), and of Nöldeke on "Der beste der arischen Pfeilschützen im Avesta und im Tabari," can only be mentioned here as containing valuable materials on these subjects. Bickell's article on Hebrew metrik is another attempt on his part to show that this metrik rests on the same principles as the Syrian, and its daughter, the Christian Greek, namely, on number of syllables, neglect of quantity, regular succession of toned and untuned syllables, identity of metrical and grammatical accent, coincidence of verse-divisions (stichoi) with sense-divisions, and the union of similar or dissimilar stichoi into regularly recurring strophes; but his procedure is arbitrary, and his thesis not proved.

5. Phöniciſche Miscellen. Von P. Schröder. (Mit 5 Tafeln.) Text, Hebrew transcription, translation, and discussion of five inscriptions found in Citium, which Schröder numbers Citiensis 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. In the first of these he finds the name of the goddess Ashera, which occurs frequently in the Old Testament, but has not before appeared in any inscription, and a new name of a month Zebahšemeš, so called from the offering made to the god Semeš. Among the especially interesting proper names are עבדאשר and אשכנז, the former rendered "servant of Osiris," and the latter, according to Schröder's conjecture, "Assur in Idalion," a strange name for a man (Assur being the principal deity of the Assyrians), but supported apparently by a similar name in an Idalion inscription. In the *Revue des Études Juives*, No. 6, p. 178, Halévy cites two other hitherto unknown Phœnician names of months, אהנב and פערית, the former of which occurs in the Old Testament.

6. Zu den himyarischen Inschriften. Von Dr. J. H. Mordtmann, Jr. (Mit 2 Tafeln.) The first plate gives a photograph of a bas-relief with inscription, published before by Mordtmann in ZDMG XXXII 400. It represents a deceased man at a meal, sitting on an armless chair, his right hand holding a cup, and his left pressed to his breast, in front of him a table with drinking-vessels,

by the table a servant holding food and cups, and beyond him a female figure, with what seems a musical instrument in its hands. A picture below portrays him on horseback, spear in hand, driving a well-drawn camel before him; that is, according to Mordtmann's suggestion, he is returning from a successful foray. The second plate represents a woman's head, with inscription. The interest of these monuments lies in the light they throw on the old South Arabian customs and art. The dress is nearly the same as that of to-day—on the head of one figure is seen something like the modern Kaffiye; the style is naïve, and there seems to be no trace of Greek influence.

7. Aegyptisch-Aramäisches. Von Franz Praetorius. The first word of the inscription on the Serapeum stone, ⲉⲣⲁⲡⲉⲩ , which Levy (ZDMG XI 69) rendered "offering" (Egypt. *athēb*), and Merx (XXII 693) "slain offering," Praetorius regards as the Egyptian *ḥtp* "gift or offering." He objects to Merx's explanation of ⲉⲣⲁⲡⲉⲩ as *pa-Neit* on the ground that Egypt. *p* is regularly rendered on the monuments by Semitic ⲡ , and not by ⲉ .

There are commendatory notices of Hoffmann's *Opuscula Nestoriana* (Syriac text, with Introduction) by Nöldeke, of Schlumberger's *Le Trésor de Sana'a* (Himyaritic coins, showing Greek influence) by Mordtmann, of Herrnsheim's *Beitrag zur Sprache der Marschall-Inseln* by Pott, and of Spitta-Bey's *Grammatik des arabischen Vulgärdialectes von Aegypten*, by Goldziher, and by Praetorius remarks on the trilingual inscription of Zebed published and explained by Sachau (*Monatsberichten der Berliner Akademie*, 1881).

IV Heft.

1. Das *Gṛhyasamgrahapariṣiṣṭa* des Gobhilaputra. Von Dr. M. Bloomfield. Text in Roman transcription, with annotated translation. The author (now in charge of Sanskrit in the Johns Hopkins University) has made a very careful and instructive study of this ritual treatise, pointing out the relation of the various parts to the sutras of Gobhila, explaining obscure passages, with constant reference to the recent edition of Gobhila's *Gṛhyasūtra* in the *Bibliotheca Indica* by the Pandit Candrakānta Tarkālāmkāra. The text is based on three MSS of the East India office.

2. *Ṭabari's Korancommentar*. Von O. Loth. Of *Ṭabari's* commentary on the Koran, which for a long time was thought to be lost, three MSS are now known, which give the greater part of this renowned work. The editing of the book Loth thinks impracticable at present, but gives a general account of the Cairo MS, with extracts. *Ṭabari's* introduction discusses the language and names of the Koran, and the divisions into suras and verses. The commentary is described by Loth as specifically dialectic, and independent and original in suggestion, though holding strictly to the conception of the Koran as a divine revelation. The monograms at the beginning of some suras, which are very variously explained by modern critics, *Ṭabari* holds to be made up of significant letters conveying religious truth; he quotes at great length the views of his predecessors. In sura 85 he does not find a reference to the martyrs of Najrān. Concerning the people of 'Ād he relates the same things as in his history. The interest of this commentary, whose date is about A. H. 300 (A. D. 912), lies in the fact that it represents the older ethical or practical, as distinguished from the later, more speculative school of theology. It is to be hoped that it will soon be published.

3. Ueber das Vaterland und das Zeitalter des Awestā. Von F. Spiegel. Against Duncker and others Spiegel maintains that Bactria was not the birth-place of the Avesta, and finds in the book itself (Yç. 19, 50-52) and elsewhere proofs that it originated in western Eran among the Medes, where in Ragha Zarathustra is said to have been both civil and religious head of the nation. He opposes also Roth's construction of the Calendar (ZDMG XXXIV 698). As to the age of the Avesta he confines himself to saying that the greater part of it was in existence in the last part of the Achemenidean period; and in general he adopts a very cautious tone with respect to the critical problems of the Zoroastrian religion.

12. Palmyrenische Inschriften. Mitgetheilt und erklärt von Ed. Sachau. In consequence of the activity of dealers in antiquities in Damascus and Aleppo, who send Arabs to Palmyra after rains to search the ruins for objects, whose original place can then not be learned by the purchaser, Sachau thinks that systematic excavation is necessary to further progress in the study of the inscriptions. He commends especially to future investigators the line of mausoleums beyond the Durra fields east and southeast of the temple of the Sun as a spot likely to yield valuable results. The 16 inscriptions which he here communicates and explains are of different lengths, but consist mainly of proper names. The expressions *בר חרי* and *בר חרי* he regards as the Syriac technical terms for *libertus* and *liberta*. He suggests that the second component of some Greek names, as *Σαμαάθου*, may be *עתי*, the name of a divinity worshipped by the Syrians (*שמע עתי*, "Athe has heard").

The other articles of this number, which I must content myself with merely mentioning, are: one on an Ethiopic MS of the "Sapiens Sapientium," by C. H. Cornill (a collation of its text with that printed in Dillmann's *Chrestomathy*); *Armeniaca II*, by H. Hübschmann; on *Kālāçoka-Udāyin*, and corrections and additions to the *Kālākāçarya-Kathānakam*, by Hermann Jacobi; on the *Soma*, by R. Roth; on the *Himyaritic-Ethiopian wars*, by J. H. Mordtmann; *Vedic Miscellanies*, by R. Pischel; remarks on the "Syrisch-römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem fünften Jahrhundert" of Bruns-Sachau (second article), by Perles (illustrations from the *Mishna* of the entrance of Roman processes into Jewish law), and a remark by Franz Praetorius on the reading of the second line of the bilingual inscription of *Ḥarrān* (he thinks it refers to the conversion of the heathen temple into a burial-place of martyrs).

Anzeigen. Praetorius recognizes the great merits of L. Stern's *Koptische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1880), especially in its fulness of materials, but finds fault with his arrangement, and some of his grammatical views. The same reviewer speaks favorably of Antoine d'Abbadie's *Dictionnaire de la langue amariñña* (Paris, 1881), but all the more deplors the author's strange doubt or denial of the Semitic character of the Amharic. Vámbéry has a notice of Count Kuun's edition of the *Codex Cumanicus* (Budapest, 1880), and of the Turkish dialect of which it treats. Goldziher calls attention to the value of Sa'adia's *Kitāb al-Amānāt wa'l-I'tiqādāt*, "Treatise on religious dogma" (edited by S. Landauer, Leiden, 1880) as an indication of the influence of Moslem theology on Jewish religious conceptions. Victor Ryssel's monograph on Gregory Thaumaturgus (Leipzig, 1880) is reviewed by Nestle, who makes some corrections

of the author's translation, but expresses a favorable opinion of the work. C. Bartolomae communicates a few readings (variations from Westergaard's text) from a MS in the library of the German Oriental Society, containing fragments of the Vendidad-Sâde.

1882. I Heft.

1. A. Socin gives a number of texts, with translation, in the Arabic dialect of Mōṣul and Mārdīn, which he originally wrote down from the mouths of natives. They consist of fables, and stories of the silliness of Kurds, and are very like some of our own folk-stories. The Arabic is simple, but differs somewhat from the western dialects in vocabulary and grammar; Socin purposes working up the language, with the aid of the Kurdish and Syriac spoken in that region.

2. Die Parsen in Persien, ihre Sprache und einige ihrer Gebräuche. Von A. Houtum-Schindler. A valuable statistical sketch of the present Parsi population of Persia, which is said to number about 8500, with comparative vocabularies of Parsi and Modern Persian, the former often showing phonetically weaker forms, as *duter, dut*, "daughter," over against Mod. Pers. *duhtar, duht*. The customs of the Parsees, the author says, such as laws of inheritance, and prayers, are the same as those described in the Avesta and other ancient books.

3. In a letter to Professor Fleischer, Dr. Franz Teufel, Assistant in the Grand-ducal library at Carlsruhe, presents his plan for preparing a political and literary history of Persia and Central Asia from the rise of the Safawī to the present time, from original sources. Working all his life, he says, under grievous difficulties, he despairs of carrying out his purpose without the aid of scholars and libraries throughout Europe. Fleischer speaks of him as a thoroughly mature scholar and worthy man, and heartily commends him to the sympathy and coöperation of all persons interested.

4. Teufel furnishes extensive annotations to Ethé's edition of Nāṣir Chusrau's Ruṣānāināma, and to Fagnan's "Le Livre de la félicité" of the same author.

5 and 6. Hübschmann continues his Armeniaca, and Pischel his Vedic Miscellanea.

7. Edessenische Inschriften. Mitgetheilt und erklärt von Ed. Sachau. As further fruit of his journey to the East in 1879-1880 Sachau here makes a beginning in Old Syrian epigraphy. Of the ten inscriptions which he publishes some were already known; but the new Syriac texts throw no little light on the palaeography and early history of Edessa. He inclines to assign one of these to the second half of the second century of our era; the others fall later. Some of the proper names seem not only to belong to the native dynasty of the second century, but also to show that the country had at that time not embraced Christianity, though this is doubtful. From Sachau's account of the wanton destruction of inscriptions now practiced by the Muhammadans it is obviously desirable that means should be taken to secure good copies immediately, and it is to be hoped, as he suggests, that the committee in charge of the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum may look to this.

8 and 9. Herrnsheim communicates remarks on Chamisso's "Radak-Vocabularium," and Dr. Alois Führer gives the titles of four Birmese law-books in addition to that edited by Richardson.

Anzeigen. Nöldeke's notice of Friedrich Delitzsch's *Wo Lag Das Paradies?* (Leipzig, 1881), while it admits the great value of the historical and geographical materials collected by the author, decides that he has failed to establish the position of the biblical Eden. The reviewer agrees in this with most of the notices of Delitzsch's work that have appeared, and the objections urged by him seem to be just. The same cannot be said of all his criticisms on the author's Assyriological material. For example, his remark that king Asurbani-pal's description of the Syrian desert ("where wild asses and gazelles do not feed") shows either that the king has been guilty of absurd exaggeration (since these animals abound in the desert), or that the passage has been mistranslated, is hasty; such a description of a frightful desert, as a strong expression for unfruitfulness, may easily be conceived. His objection to the Assyrian *uṣṣū*'s representing Arabic *ḥiṣn*, founded on the ignoring of the *ḥ* (p. 181), is not well taken, since precisely this dropping of the Semitic *ḥ* is a regular phenomenon in Assyrian. Nor does it seem reasonable to depreciate Assyrian studies in general (p. 182, note 1) because Sayce, "who passes for a master," has "made mistakes in Hebrew grammar" in his explanation of the Siloam inscription.

II Heft.

Beiträge zur jüdisch-apokalyptischen Literatur. Von Karl Wieseler. For the determination of the date of the Book of Enoch, Wieseler examines the visions of the 70 shepherds, and the 70 weeks of the world's history (89, 56—90, 19). The shepherds he makes angels (since earthly rulers are represented under the form of animals), and assigns to each a period of seven years. This arrangement, he thinks, makes the chronology of the book consistent with itself, and gives a period of 490 years for the shepherds, to be reckoned from the destruction of the temple B. C. 589—588. The visions, however, he supposes were probably written shortly before the close of this period, about the time of king John Hyrcanus I, B. C. 130. He assigns the same date to the Messianic section, Chs. 37—71. The proper name Taxo (Latin for "badger") in the *Assumptio Mosis*, c. 9, he regards as symbolic designation of a Zealot, who proposes to his sons to go into a cave in order to keep God's commandments, in the time of Herod the Great, as was done in the Maccabean period. Identical with this, he thinks, is the surname of Simon, *Θασσί*, I Mac. 2, 3, Heb. *רִחֲשִׁי*, from *רִחַשׁ* "badger." As to this last, the Heb. word is now usually, following the Arabic, held to mean "seal."

2. Abhandlung über das Licht von Ibn al-Haiṭam. Herausgegeben und übersetzt von Dr. J. Baermann. Ibn al-Haiṭam (A. D. 965—1038) is reckoned one of the greatest of the Arabic medieval physicists and mathematicians, and this edition of his work on Light is welcome. The editor had before him only one MS, Sprenger 1834, in the Royal Library at Berlin.

3. Socin gives further texts in the Arabic dialect of Mesopotamia, this time from that of Mārdīn. See first article in the preceding Heft.

4. Beiträge zur Erklärung des Kitāb al-Fihrist. Von Ig. Goldziher in Budapest. These remarks refer to the Fihrist's designations of the Sunnites and of the Vulgar Arabic.

5. Das Eigenthumsrecht nach moslemischem Rechte. Von Baron von Törnauw. After stating as his general conclusions that Moslem law recognizes a complete right of property in one's possessions, and has greatly modified the principle that a public treasury belongs to the whole Moslem religious community, the author gives a list of original sources, and an elaborate and valuable treatise on the Moslem right of property.

6. Die persischen Bruchzahlen bei Belādhori. Von M. J. de Goeje. The author points out that the Persian words for fractions ended in *oda* or *ota* (*dahota* = $\frac{1}{10}$), and this reading is accepted by Olshausen, who had given a different form (Berlin Acad. of Sciences, June, 1881).

7. Professor Dozy communicates the titles of some Arabic MSS lately discovered in Granada, on history, philosophy, and medicine, among them one, almost illegible, written in Morocco.

8. A study by Sachau of the trilingual inscription of Zebed, word by word.

9. Der Adler mit dem Soma. Von R. Roth. An examination of Rigveda 4, 27, for the purpose not of explaining the myth, but, so far as possible, of establishing the text; his restored text exhibits the eagle not in the usual character of bearer of the soma from heaven, but as one who snatches it from demons. Roth urges the necessity of careful study of small parts of the RV, to prepare the way for some future translator who shall do for it what Voss did for Homer.

10. Beiträge zur Kenntniss indischer Dichter. Von Theodor Aufrecht. Verses from less known poets, collected from various sources, with translations and short notes.

C. H. TOY.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE, 1881.

Avril-Mai-Juin. I. Continuation by Halévy of his examination of the Saba inscriptions.

2. Études sur l'histoire d'Éthiopie. Première Partie: Chronique Éthiopienne, d'après un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, par M. René Basset. Text, omitting fol. 2, of which a translation with historical notes is given. This chronicle, written in the first half of the last century, undertakes to give the annals from Adam down to the author's time, and will doubtless clear up some obscurities in the history of Ethiopia. Basset accords to Bruce the honor of having reintroduced this subject to the attention of European scholars, after the labors of Ludolf and others had almost been forgotten.

3. Observations sur le Vendidad, par M. J. Darmesteter. I. This is a reply to Harlez's criticisms on Darmesteter's translation of the Vendidad (Vol. IV of *Sacred Books of the East*). The latter states his own critical position to be as follows: The doctrine contained in the Zoroastrian books existed as early as the fall of the Achaemenides, but only as the faith of the Magi, who also held to dualism and Ahriman in the time of Herodotus; the Magi were a

Median sacerdotal caste, and the writers of the Avesta, the cradle of Zoroastrianism being Media; the Magi reached the doctrines of the Avesta by developing the latent dualism of the old Indo-Iranian religion, and the old Aryan conception of the purity of the elements; they were probably introduced into Persia by Cyrus, were suppressed by Darius, and six centuries later became victorious; Ormazd is Indo-Iranian and Indo-European, a derivation from the old god of heaven; Ahriman is not Indo-European, but Indo-Iranian, partly derived from the old storm-demons, and partly the evil counterpart of Ormazd; and the learned religion established above these two a supreme principle, whence both were held to emanate. Darmesteter further states that he is neither exclusively Vedist nor traditionist, but uses both Veda and tradition, the latter to go as far as it will carry him, and the former to reach the primitive Aryan faith whence both Vedism and Mazdeism are derived.

4. *Études Bouddhiques. Comment on devient Pratyeka-Buddha*, par M. Léon Feer. The Bodhi of the Pratyeka-Buddha is the second of the three grades, the first being that of the *Çrāvakas* (hearers), and the third that of the Buddhas. Feer here describes its nature, and the mode of attaining it, giving extracts from the *Avadāna-Çataka*, full of curious details.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. There are commendatory notices of West's *Pahlavi Texts Translated* (Vol. V of *Sacred Books of the East*), by Harlez, of Nève's French translation of Bhavabhūti's *Dénouement of the History of Rāma*, by Senart, and of Pertsch's *Catalogue of the Arabic MSS in the Gotha Ducal Library*, by Zotenberg.—Barbier de Meynard finds E. H. Palmer's *Haroun Arraschid, Caliph of Bagdad* (London, 1881), lacking in breadth and precision, though written with grace and skill. He calls attention to the formation in London of the Pāli Text Society, for which the aid of American scholars has already been asked.

Août-Septembre. 1. René Basset continues his annotated translation of the *Ethiopian Chronicle*, MS 151 of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale.

2. *Les prétendus problèmes d'Algèbre du Manuel du Calculateur Égyptien* (Papyrus Rhind), par M. Léon Rodet. The author seeks to show, against Professors Eisenlohr and Cantor of Heidelberg, that this papyrus contains not algebraic, but only arithmetical processes, and that the Egyptian writer was not acquainted with multiplication and division, but only with addition and subtraction; he gives also interesting notices of the medieval Arabian and Jewish arithmetic. Throughout Europe, he remarks, up to the 16th century, books on arithmetic made doubling and halving special operations, distinct from multiplication and division.

3. *Matériaux pour le dictionnaire assyrien*, par M. Arthur Amiaud. Along with some already generally admitted facts Amiaud makes valuable contributions to the Assyrian lexicon. The passages which he cites from W. A. I. for the reading of the plural of the first personal pronoun are not new; the probable forms *anini* and *nini* are well known, but the mutilated readings in two cases have been considered to make the pronunciation somewhat uncertain.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. Halévy thinks that the Tyropoeon of Josephus is the same with the *ašpoth* of Neh. iii. 14 ("dung"), which Josephus read *špoth* (v. 13)

and rendered "cheese"; he also suggests that the word *betyl* is connected not with *bethel* "house of God," but with *bethul* "young man," or, more probably, with some geographical name.—Huart continues his Chinese miscellanies, and gives a favorable notice of Abou-z-Ziya's Turkish Chrestomathy, Constantinople, 1879, press of Mehrān, which he calls a most happy essay in Turkish literary history.—Aristide Marre furnishes a Malay Bibliography, namely, three works on the Malay language by Captain Badings, of Amsterdam.

Octobre–Novembre–Décembre. The body of this number consists of continuations of articles above mentioned, namely, History of Ethiopia, by René Basset; Supposed Problems in Algebra, by Léon Rodet; Buddhist Studies (How one becomes Arhat), by Léon Feer; and Moslem Numismatics and Metrology, by H. Sauvaire—all valuable treatises, worked out in detail. There is added a note by C. de Harlez, stating his position on the Avestan question; Zoroastrianism, he says (against Darmesteter), is not at all a product of an evolution of the old polytheistic religion, but its essential parts sprang from speculations and combinations of the Mazdean priests, perhaps from loans made by them from other cults.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. In addition to the very interesting Chinese Miscellanies, there are notices by Barbier de Meynard of Hartwig Derenbourg's edition of the Arabic Text of Sibawaihi's Kitāb (treatise on grammar), Paris, 1881, and of Charles Rieu's Catalogue of the Persian MSS in the British Museum, Vol. II, 1881.

1882.

Janvier. 1. Sur quelques noms arabes qui figurent dans les inscriptions grecques de l'Auranitide, par M. E. Renan. This memoir, reprinted from the *Bulletin archéologique français* of September, 1856, is an examination of the proper names in a dozen Greek inscriptions copied by J. L. Porter in 1853, and interpreted by T. D. Woolsey in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, V. 1 (1855). According to Renan, ἀβεβος is Ḥabīb, μανος Ma'an, θαιμος Taim-allah, μαλχος Mālik, σαλαμανης Salmān, αυσος Aus-allah, ζοβεδος Zobeid, οναυος (corrected by Woolsey from ομαιμος) Ḥonein, and οαιθελος Wāthil. He calls attention to the exclusively Arabic character of the proper names in this region in the middle Semitic period (between the decay of Hebrew and the rise of Islam), and finds in this fact and in the monotheistic form of some of them an indication that the Arabian race was gradually developing politically and religiously for five or six centuries before Mohammed. The fact that the tribe-names are those of individuals who founded families shows, he thinks, that the Arabian heroic period was relatively modern, and from the accuracy of the Greek transcriptions he infers the relatively pure character of the Hellenism of the Roman province of Arabia.

2. Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes, traduits ou recueillis et mis en ordre, par M. H. Sauvaire, Consul de France. Première partie: Monnaies. (Suite.) A valuable collection of materials, but too detailed to admit of an abstract.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. Léon Feer commends Huart's edition of Les Instructions Familiales of Tchou-pō-lou (a treatise on practical ethics), with text, and

free and literal translations, for beginners in Chinese, 1881, and takes occasion to insist on the necessity of a scientific scheme of transliteration.—De Harlez has a highly commendatory notice of the Pehlevi text *Dinkart* “La Forteresse de la Foi,” edited for the first time, with Zend transcription, Guzerati and English translations, explanatory notes, and glossary of difficult terms, by Desur Peshotun Behramji Semgana, 1881.—Barbier de Meynard mentions a recent translation of some plays of Molière into Turkish, by Véfyk Pasha.

Février-Mars. 1. Continuation of the Moslem Numismatics and Metrology, by Sauvaire.

2. Bibliographie Ottomane. Notice des livres turcs, arabes, et persans imprimés à Constantinople durant la période 1297-1298 de l'hégire (1880-1881). Par M. Clément Huart. Deuxième article. (See *Journ. Asiat.*, Oct. 1880.) According to Huart, the Turkish literary renaissance is advancing slowly but surely. At Constantinople are published nine newspapers in Turkish (of which three are official), one in Arabic, and one in Persian; and for the foreign communities six in French, seven in Greek, six in Armenian, and two in Spanish-Hebrew. Egypt has five Arabic papers, one Arabic-Turkish, three French, two Italian, one English, and one Greek; Beirut six Arabic, one Arabic-French, and three weekly Reviews in Arabic; Smyrna one Turkish paper, one French, two Greek, and one Armenian; Salonica one Turkish and one Greek; and Eastern Rumelia one Bulgarian-French, one Greek-French, and one Turkish. Official newspapers are printed in the principal places of twenty-four provinces of the empire; there are forty-five printing establishments at Stambul, and twenty-three at Galata and Pera. Huart's list comprises 218 books, in the departments of theology, religious sciences, legislation, literature, ethics, poetry, history, biography, various sciences, linguistics, composition, and grammar, together with periodicals.

3. Une nouvelle inscription cambodgienne, par M. Abel Bergaigne. The first facsimiles of Cambodian inscriptions were given about nine years ago by Francis Garnier; the alphabet was easily made out, and two years ago Aymonier, then resident in Cambodge, and well acquainted with the modern tongue of the country, published interpretations of the ancient language. Professor Kern, of Leiden, had already given translations of some Sanskrit inscriptions, which language was also employed by former kings of Cambodge. Bergaigne gives transcription and partial translation of the new inscription of which a facsimile has been obtained by Aymonier. The Sanskrit portion contains an address to Çiva, and refers to the consecration of a linga in the year 976 of the Çaka era (A. D. 1054), the style being that of the Upanishads. The translation of the Cambodian portion Bergaigne leaves to Aymonier.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. É. Senart offers some remarks in an Appendix on conclusions as to the relative age of Pracrit dialects derived from linguistic considerations; he purposes presenting his view in full either in the epilogue to his *Essay on the Inscriptions of Piyadasi*, or in the linguistic memoir which is to accompany the last volume of his edition of the *Mahāvastu*. His point is that the degree of linguistic degeneration in writings is not always a sure mark of age, for the reason that in some of these a sort of artificial dialect exists,

resulting from a learned adoption of ancient forms; he cites the coexistence in the same writings of *ṣṭ* and *ṭh*, corresponding to Sanskrit *śṭ*, the presence or absence of the *r*, and the conjunction of Pracrit and Sanskrit forms. He would not limit this phenomenon to inscriptions, but finds it also in the Buddhist Sanskrit. He concludes that we have not the right to found *a priori* on the consecrated orthography of the dialects any theory of their antiquity, though they all rest in the last analysis on real languages which at a given moment were popular; and as to the Buddhist Sanskrit in particular, he thinks there are indications that it is anterior to the Pracrit orthographic type, in the form in which the latter is fixed by the grammarians.—In a second appendix Antoine d'Abbadie defends his non-Semitic translation of the Ethiopian coin-word *Jān* by "elephant" against the Semitic rendering "judge" proposed by Halévy. The latter takes it to be equivalent to *dayan*; d'Abbadie states, from personal observation, that the modern Amara do not change Ge'ez *daya* into *ja*, and that he has got the rendering "elephant" from native Kamites, and found it in an ancient chronicle applied in this sense to the king.—Imbault-Huart continues his Chinese Miscellanies, giving an account of the reigning family, together with anecdotes of the Mongol dynasty, and an apologue.—There is a notice by Pavet de Courteille of the Codex Cumanicus of the Library of Saint Mark, Venice, recently published, with prolegomena, notes, and glossaries, by Count Kuun, member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapesth, 1880). The MS contains a rich store of vocabularies and texts of this dialect, spoken by a people who dwelt formerly on the east of the Caspian Sea, but have since been displaced. The language is described as resembling that of the Turkish tribes of Southern Siberia. The present publication is awarded high praise by the reviewer.—Barbier de Meynard reports that the mission to Tunis, recently despatched by the Minister of Public Instruction, has collected a good number of Arabic inscriptions, posterior to the third century of the Hegira, interesting for the history of Arabic palaeography in Northern Africa.

Avril-Mai-Juin. 1. Continuation of Moslem Numismatics and Metrology, by H. Sauvaire.

2. Études Bouddhiques. *Mésaventures des Arhats*, par M. Léon Feer. The author, in continuation of his Buddhist Studies, here describes the contents of the Tenth Decad of the Avadāna-Çataka, under four heads: the misfortunes of the heroes; the culpable acts to which these are due; the virtuous actions of the same heroes; the attainment of the state of Arhat. The crimes, repentance and virtues are mostly ceremonial, and the sufferings physical. It appears that the greatest crimes do not prevent a man from attaining the state of perfect union with Buddha, and this state does not save him from punishment. Good actions counterbalance bad, yet not always perfectly. We have in these narratives an unsuccessful attempt to solve the enigma of the relation between moral acts and the events of life.

3. Études sur l'épigraphie du Yémen, par MM. Joseph et Hartwig Derenbourg. This is a learned and valuable discussion of several Sabeen inscriptions and words, with a good many attempts at conjectural emendations of the texts, the correctness of which can be tested only by further researches. Among other things the authors propose for the signification of *ṣaṭar* (which commonly

means "to write"), "to draw a line, mark out the limits of a country" (as in the Arab. stem *ḥaṭṭa*), render *ba. half* by "in the province," and find evidence that Farī' was the last Yemenite king of the second period, and his sons begin the third period, when the centre of gravity passed westward to Raidan. Messrs. Derenbourg intend to continue these studies, from which we may hope for additions to our knowledge of Yemenite epigraphy.

4. Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi, par M. Senart. Deuxième Partie. On the edicts of the column of Delhi or of Firuz Shah, with transcription, translation, and grammatical notes. The excellence of Senart's work is abundantly acknowledged by scholars in this department.

5. Essai sur les inscriptions du Safa, par M. J. Halévy. (Suite et fin.) Halévy here concludes his admirable work on the Safa inscriptions by a sketch of the grammar of the language, a short account of the history of the Arabs of the north, a discussion of Safa names of men and gods, and of Greek transliterations of Arabic and Nabathean names, and a vocabulary of the Safean language. This tongue he holds to be Arabic, but different from the dialect of Hijaz, approaching in some points the Hebrew and Phenician, occupying, in fact, a position midway between these last and the Arabic of the Kuran.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. Stanislas Guyard gives notes on four words of the inscriptions of Van, and August Eisenlohr, Professor of Egyptology at Heidelberg, replies to the criticisms of L. Rodet on his translation of an Egyptian mathematical manual (1877).—Ch. Brosselard, in a letter to Renan, announces his intention to bring out a Berber-French dictionary, a work which will be welcome to students of the Berber or Libyan dialects.—In his Chinese Miscellanies Huart relates, among other things, the fortunes of General Ward, a native of Salem, Mass., who acted as Free Lance on the imperial side in the Taiping rebellion, and was killed in battle (1862).—Rubens Duval has a notice of Joseph Derenbourg's edition of Deux versions hébraïques du livre de Kalilāh et Dimnāh (49th part of the Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études), Paris, Vieweg, 1881. The first of these versions, attributed to Rabbi Joel, is especially valuable for the criticism of the Arabic text from which it was made, and which was a rendering of the Pehlvi version of the original Hindu work.

C. H. Toy.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. X, Part I.

The first article in this number (pp. 1-26) is by S. A. Naber, entitled "Euri-pidea," in which he comments on various passages in the Rhesus, Alcestis, Hippolytus, Medea, Andromache, and Troades. In Rhes. 274, μάχας πρὸ χειρῶν καὶ δόρη βαστάζομεν, he objects to explaining μάχας by zeugma, and proposes μάχαι, which has been already suggested by Vater. On Rhes. 327-8 ὁρθῶς ἀτίσεις κάπτιμοφος εἰ φίλοις δέχον δὲ τοὺς θέλοντας ὠφελεῖν πῶλον, which are addressed by the chorus to Hector, who has just rebuked Rhesus for his late arrival, his comment is: "quid est ineptire nisi hoc est? duo versiculi sunt, qui adversis frontibus concurrunt, uti vides. Unum semicolum si addideris, ex his

tenebris emerges: ὀρθῶς· ἀτίξεις κἀπίμοφος εἰ φίλοις," taking ὀρθῶς in the sense of καλῶς ἔχειν, χαίρειν as explained by Plut. Mor. p. 22 f. ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ καλῶς φαμὲν ἔχειν καὶ χαίρειν κελεύομεν, όταν μὴ δεχώμεθα μὴδὲ λαμβάνωμεν. He thinks the καλῶς in St. Mark vii 6, 9 is perhaps to be explained in the same way. On 646, which is addressed by Pallas, in the guise of Aphrodite, to Paris, θάρσει· φυλάσσει σ' ἡδὲ πρηνυμένης Κύπρις, he insists on writing φυλάσσω, since though one often speaks of oneself in the third person, "nemo hoc facit dum vult declarare ipsum se praesentem adesse." Many examples of this are given; but it is remarked that in Iph. Taur. 770 ἡ'ν Ἀνλίδι σφαγεῖσ' ἐπιστέλλει τάδε ζῶσ' Ἱφιγένεια, the third person is rightly given; for the first would have prematurely revealed her.

In Alc. 161 he would read ἐκπρεπῶς ἡσκήσατο for εὐπρεπῶς: "nam honesta mulier semper εὐπρεπῶς vestita est, sed ultimo vitae die fecit quod festis diebus ceteroquin solebat facere et ἐκπρεπῶς ἡσκήσατο." In Alc. 321, οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μῆνός ἐρχεται κακόν, he will not accept Wecklein's τριταῖον ἡμαρ nor Herwerden's τρίτον μοι φέγγος, "sed multo leniore medicina rescribi poterit, οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι σμῆνος ἐρχεται κακόν."

In Med. 11 he would read ἀλλάσσουνσα μὲν . . . αὐτὴ δὲ κτέ: "hoc dicit nutrix: propter Peliae caedem coacta quidem fuit solum vertere et Corinthum migrare, sed mansit cum marito fidelis concordia." To confirm this use of ἀλλάσσειν Plat. Polit. 289 e is quoted: οἱ δὲ πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως ἀλλάσσοντες κατὰ θάλατταν καὶ περὶ ἡ.

On Hipp. 42, δείξω δὲ Θησεῖ πρᾶγμα κάκφανήσεται, he says: "quid unquam inepte abundabit si post δείξω Θησεῖ πρᾶγμα probare debemus κάκφανήσεται?" and proposes κάκφανήσεται sc. ὀθσεύς. On 79, ὅσοις διδάκτον μὴδὲν, he writes: "credamus licet virtutem nobis a natura tribui, disciplina non comparari, legerit denique Penthesileae filius Platonis Protagoram, tamen affirmare non poterit disciplinam virtuti officere, eumque prae ceteris σωφρονεῖν qui nihil didicerit," and proposes ὅσοις ἄλαστον μὴδὲν, quoting the words of Theseus in 877 βοᾷ δέλτος ἄλαστα. In 982 for τὰ γὰρ δὴ πρῶτ' ἀνέστραπται πάλιν he suggests 'στῶτ'. In 1085, for πάλαι ξενοῦσθαι τόνδε προῖν' ἔποντά με, he proposes 'ξεῶσθαι, referring to the reply of Hippol. in 1087 σὺ δ' αὐτός, εἰ σοι θυμός, ἐξῶθει χθονός.

On Androm. 177, ἂ μὴ παρ' ἡμᾶς ἐσφερ', he writes: "quia peregrini mores introducuntur et εἰσάγονται nec feruntur nec portantur neque adeo φέρονται vel εἰσφέρονται, malim ἐσφρες": and, referring to Cobet's collection of the instances of this verb, V. L. p. 575, "quod exempla declarant . . . verbum φρεῖν usurpatum fere de iis quae clam fiunt . . . quo certius pateat in Androm. itidem ἐσφρες reponendum esse." On 1272, πᾶσιν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν ἡδὲ πρὸς θεῶν ψῆφος κέκρανται, κατθανεῖν τ' ὀφείλεται, he writes: "per se quidem nihil est cur his verbis offendamur . . . est autem sciendum, in Parisino Codice τ' omissum esse; et quia notum est apud Euripidem histriones saepe partium suarum quasi oblitos sese ad spectatores convertere, qua de re Cobetus dixit in Var. Lect. p. 587, vide num probari debeat, ἡδὲ πρὸς θεῶν ψῆφος κέκρανται· κατθανεῖν ὀφείλετε." But Cobet's remark is: "saepius enim Euripides veluti argumenti oblitus spectatores admonet in cavea sedentes."

On Troad. 440 he writes: "sine sensu Casandra vaticinatur de Solis bubus, αἱ σάρκα φωνήσσαν ἡσούνιν ποτε, πικρὰν Ὀδυσσεὶ γῆρυν. Respicit poeta, quod etiam pueri intelligunt, Homeri verba in Odys. μ 394:

τοῖσιν δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοὶ τέραα προῦφαινον·
εἶρπον μὲν ῥινόι, κρέα δ' ἄμφ' ὀβελοῖς ἐμεμύκει,
ὀπαλᾶ τε καὶ ὠμά· βοῶν δ' ὥς γίγνεται φωνή.

Sed φωνὴν λέναι quid sit, satis novimus; quid autem est σάρκα λέναι? Kirchhoffius putavit satis esse, si rescriberet ἔξουσιν, sed eum ipsum fugere non potuit, quam parum poeta digna ea 'locutio sit. Nec magis dicere possis quomodo facillimum verbum ἔξουσιν mutari potuerit in ἵσουσιν. Sed quid cesso veram lectionem expromere? Lege: ὦν σάρκα φωνήεσαν εὔσουσιν ποτε, πικρὰν Ὀδύσσει γῆρυν. Demit aliquid de fabula Casandra atque portentum etiam sic satis magnum fecit paulo credibilius. Accusativum πικρὰν γῆρυν retulerim ad adiectivum φωνήεσαν."

The second article (pp. 27-41) is by Cobet, on the fragments of Eunapius, in Müller's *Hist. Graec. Fragm.* There is much that is interesting in these notes, though only a few extracts can be made. "Ad fragm. 1. Solus omnium Historicorum Eunapius profitetur se iudice Chronologiam in historia scribenda esse inutilem: οἱ ἄκριβεῖς λογισμοὶ τῶν χρόνων ὥσπερ ἀκλῆτοι μάρτυρες αὐτομάτων ἐπεισιόντες ἐς ταῦτα ὨΦΕΛΟΥΣΙΝ ΟΥΔΕΝ, et post pauca: κενὴ τις καὶ ἀχρεῖος ἡ περὶ τοὺς χρόνους διατριβὴ καὶ σχολή, idque verum esse levissimis quibusdam argumentis demonstrare sat agit, veluti his: τίς λόγος πρὸς ἱστορίας τέλος εἰδέναι ὅτι τὴν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίαν ἐνίκων οἱ Ἕλληνες κυνὸς ἐπιτέλλοντος; τί δ' ὄφελος ἦν τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν εἰς ὠφέλειαν ἱστορικῆς χρείας εἰ κατὰ ταύτην ἐτέχθη τὴν ἡμέραν ὃ δεῖνα καὶ μελοποιὸς ἀνέσχευεν ἢ τραγῳδὸς ἄριστος." It is shown that Eunapius constantly borrows from Plutarch without naming him. "Fragm. 14, 2. ὁ Ῥωμαῖος Μάριος τὸν ἀντίπαλον Σύλλαν διπλοῦν θηρίον ἀποκαλὼν ἀλώπεκα καὶ λέοντα μᾶλλον ἔφασκε φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἀλώπεκα. Plutarchus in *Sulla* 28, 18. Κάρβονά φασιν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἀλώπεκι καὶ λέοντι πολεμῶν ἐν τῇ Σύλλᾳ ψυχῇ κατοικοῦσιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀλώπεκος ἀνὴρ το μᾶλλον. Memoriter haec referens Eunapius pro Carbone, quem non noverat, notissimum Marium substituit." "Fragm. 24. φασὶν Ἀλεξάνδρον θειάζοντος ἑαυτὸν ἐκ Διὸς Ὀλυμπιάδα θρυπτομένην φάσκειν· 'οὐ παύσεται τὸ μεράκιον διαβάλλον με πρὸς τὴν Ἥραν.' Sumsit perlepidum Olympiadis dictum ex Plutarchi vita *Alexandri* cap. 3. φασὶν αὐτὴν (*Olympiadem*) λέγειν 'οὐ παύσεται με διαβάλλον Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τὴν Ἥραν.' Plutarchus temporum gnarus nōn potuit Alexandrum μεράκιον appellare, ut Eunapius." Emendations are suggested for a large number of the fragments, many of which must be looked upon as certain. *E. g.* "Fragm. 48 de Theodosio scribit eum initio imperii magnas opes inconsulto absumsisse καθάπερ μεράκιον ΜΕΛΛόπλουτον πατὴρ ἐπὶ χρόνῳ πολλὰ χρήματα σεσωρευκὸς διὰ σωφροσύνης καὶ φειδῶ . . . μαίνεται. Unice verum est Νεόπλουτον. Ne est quidem Graecum vocabulum μελλόπλουτος neque sanam notionem continet. Μελλόγαμος et μελλόνυμφος recte dicitur qui iamiam uxorem ducturus est, qui in eo est ut νυμφίος fiat, sed filius familiae divite patre superstitute semper est μελλόπλουτος. Manifesto comparatur Theodosius cum adolescente dissoluto qui patrimonium recens acceptum prodigit et dilapidat. Νεόπλουτος δέσποινα legitur in *vitis Sophist.* p. 99." On the style of this author Cobet writes: "Eunapius in *Historiis* utitur oratione perinde putida et affectata atque in *Sophistarum vitis*. Amplificat omnia, exaggerat et quasi inflat tumore verborum. *Magna laus* est οὐρανοῦηκης. Qui imbibit aliquid χανδὸν ἀνέται, ἐμφορεῖται, κατεμφορεῖται. Qui se aliquo confert συνωθεῖται ποι, et plurima habet de genere hoc similia Quae

Veteres parce ac raro usurpant apud eum ad fastidium usque repetuntur . . . Alibi formis Ionicis abutitur, ut passim in *καλὸν τι χρῆμα, πολὺ τι χρῆμα* et similis compluribus . . . et saepe *θέσθαι* pro *ποιήσασθαι* . . . et *antistes Deae Syriae* fr. 94 Herodoteo vocabulo *μελεδωνὸς τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ* nominatur. Non tantum in verbis, sed etiam in rebus Eunapium omnem modum excedere ostendet fragmentum 76; quum vellet dicere Romanum ducem *esse mulierosum et temulentum* dixit eum *πλείους ἔχειν παλλακίδας τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ πλείονα πίνειν ἢ ὅσα πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι πίνουνσιν.*"

The next article (pp. 42–66) is also by Cobet, on passages of the *Epistolographi Graeci*, ed. Hercher. Only one or two of his notes can be given. "Alciph. III 1, p. 67 οὐκέτ' εἰμὶ ἐν ἔμῳ HI, ὧ μῆτερ. In tali re constanter et veteres et sequiores dicebant ἐν ἔμῳ HΣ *non sum apud me*. Arist. Vesp. 642, ὡς οὗτος ἤδη σκορδινᾷται κάσιν οὐκ ἐν αὐτοῦ, ubi Ravennas mendose, ut Graeculi solent, exhibet ἐν αὐτῷ." [But apparently all MSS read in Xen. An. I, 5, 17 ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐγένετο, and in Soph. Phil. 950 ἐν παντὶ γενεῶν.] On Julian. Epist. IX, § 3, p. 340, τὸν μακαριώτατον Κωνσταντίον ἐρεῖτε, we are told to read "quod *de defunctis* usitatum est τὸν μακαρίτην Κωνσταντίον," and it is explained that originally the epithet *μακαρίτης* was used to express the highest degree of happiness of the living as well as of the dead. Cf. Aesch. Pers. 633; Ar. Plut. 555. But as such happiness could rarely be predicated of the living "ad eos trahi coeptum est qui vitae laboribus et aerumnis defuncti beatam aetatem agerent." And so from the time of Menander the dead in general came to be called *μακαρίται*. "Photius Μακαρίτας: τοὺς τεθνηκότας Μένανδρος. Timaeus, v. Βάλλ' ἐς μακαρίαν: τοὺς ἀποθονόντας μακαρίτας ἔθος καλεῖν. Neque tamen promiscue omnes, qui diem obissent, *μακαρίτας* appellitabant, sed quos quisque in vita dilectos aut cognitos habuisset . . . Nullus hodie Menandri locus superest in quo ὁ μακαρίτης eo sensu legatur, sed apud Alciphronem legitur, qui pleraque omnia sua a Menandro sumsit . . . Tandem apud Christianos *μακαρίται* dicebantur omnes, quorum memoria pie colebatur, vel apostolorum vel principum, qui Christianis faverissent, veluti ὁ μακαρίτης Παῦλος, ὁ μακαρίτης Πέτρος, ὁ μακαρίτης Κωνσταντῖνος . . . et similia passim."

The next article (pp. 67–95) is by van Herwerden, *ad Comicos Graecos*. We have first notes on several fragments which appear in Kock's recent edition, and also on certain passages of Aristophanes. It is natural that the fragments referred to should be those as to which the judgment of the writer differs from that of the editor; and therefore, as no general opinion is expressed as to the character of the edition, none can be inferred from the unfavorable tone of most of these criticisms. On Crates, fr. 14 for the corrupt *αὐτή, παρασκευάζεσαντόν*, Kock proposes *ἄμης*. But Herwerden shows that it must be some kind of "convivii instrumentum" which is addressed, and suggests himself *ψυκτήρ* or *κρατήρ*, preferring the former. On Pherecr. fr. 1, ὡς ὀλιγόσιτος ἦσθ' ἄρ', δε κατεσθίεις τῆς ἡμέρας μακρᾶς τριήρους σιτία, he admits that his own previous suggestion that *μακρᾶς* is to be taken with *ἡμέρας* has been rightly rejected by Kock. It is equally impossible, however, to connect it with *τριήρους* "quasi *βραχεῖαι τριήρεις* exstiterint. Eadem res profligat Meinekii coniecturam *μικρᾶς*," and the reading *μικροῦ* is suggested. "Triremis cibaria diurna erant quatuor ferme medimnorum . . . ut interlocutor hominem *φαενη* tantum consumere cum comica exaggeratione

tionem dicere potuerit." On Aristoph. fr. 230, in which Kock inserts *εὐπετῶς* he writes: "peccavit contra sermonem comicorum, qui numquam *εὐπετῶς*, (nec, hoc sensu *εὐχερῶς*), sed constanter *ῥαδίως* dixerunt. Verum sermonis proprietatem parum curare solet editor, qui Pherecrati fr. 143, pro *λεπτάς* reddi iussit *λευράς*, in Aristophane fr. 640 tolerandum putat *ἐξαχοίνικον* pro *ἐκχοίνικον*, apud eundem fr. 898 retinuit formam pessimam *ὀφλῶν* pro *ὀφλῶν*, alia quae referre taedet." On Arist. Thesm. 930, οὐτος τί κίπτεις; Δῆσον αὐτὸν εἰσάγων, he writes: "Quia severior grammatica, quam pedestres sequuntur, postularet *ἐσαγῶν*, non inutile erit monere saepe Aristophanem, spectatorum auribus consulentem, in talibus uti Praesentis participio. Cf. Nub. 1213; Pac. 882; Vesp. 170, 177; Av. 658; Eq. 1367; Ran. 981; Pac. 49, 288, 1219. Similiter *ἰών* et *τρέχων* pro *ἐλθών* et *δραμών*, quae res olim fefellit Meinekium ad Plut. 1103 ἀλλ' ἐκκάλει τὸν δεσπότην τρέχων ταχύ, adnotantem: 'expectabam Aoristum, quo in tali oratione si recte memini, constanter Aristophanes utitur.' Male meminerat vir egregius et, si quis alius, *μνημονεύς*. Vid. Pac. 259; Nub. 780, 1164; Ach. 176."

The last article (pp. 96-112) contains notes by Cobet on Madvig's edition of Livy (1861-4). A large number of these are devoted to the expulsion of 'puerilia et insulsa additamenta,' which he is astonished to see 'etiam in antiquissimis Codicibus circumferri.' As a specimen may be quoted: "multas saepe vidi absurdas interpolationes indoctorum hominum, sed neminem qui magis deliraret quam is qui apud Livium XXI 40, 7, ad verba; *duabus partibus peditum equitumque in transitu Alpium amissis*, annotavit: *quum plures paene perierint quam supersunt*. Imperitus homuncio ne hoc quidem sciebat quid esset *duabus partibus amissis*, atque hi nugatores nos in Livio legendo ludificantur." On VII 17, 4: *consul legatigue ac tribuni puerorum ritu vana* MIRACULA *pavescentes irridebant increpabantque*, he writes: "ridicule *miracula* in tali re ponuntur. Lege vana TERRICULA, ut V 9, 7; XXXIV 11, 7."

On XXXVIII 23, 8: *Claudius . . . ad quadraginta millia hominum auctor est caesa, Valerius Antias, qui MAGIS immodicus in numero augendo esse solet, non plus decem millia*: he writes: "mendosum est MAGIS IMMODICUS, quae verba coniungi non possunt. Dici potuit aut; *qui ALIAS immodicus*, aut ut pressius ductus literarum sequamur: *qui IN ALIIS immodicus esse solet*. Cf. XXXIII 10, *si Valerio quis credat omnium rerum immodice numerum augenti*, et de eodem XXVI 49, adeo nullus mentiendi modus est. Nempe quum scorpiones capti essent *ad sexaginta*, Valerius *undeviginti millia* capta esse scripserat." On XLV 32, 3, *quos cum liberis maioribus quam quindecim annos natis praecedere in Italiam placeret*, he writes: "non est haec in tali re Latina orationis forma, sed *cum liberis maioribus quindecim annis*, expuncto *quam* et *natis*. Duplex loquendi genus confusum est: *maioribus annis quindecim* et *plus quam quindecim annos natis*. Cf. XL 37, 3, *maiores duodecim annis omnes coronati*; XLII 34, 11, *viginti duo stipendia annua in exercitu emerita habeo et maior annis sum quinquaginta*.

In parts of some pages otherwise unoccupied Cobet continues his notes on Galen.

C. D. MORRIS.

HERMES. 1881.

No. III.¹

Points of language determining the chronological order of the dialogues of Plato ("Sprachliche Kriterien für die Chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge"), by W. Dittenberger. In this noteworthy contribution Professor Dittenberger first takes up Plato's usage of *μήν*, as observed in the following combinations: *καὶ μήν*, *ἀλλὰ μήν*, *τί μήν*, *γε μήν*, *ἀλλὰ—μήν*. A conspectus is presented on p. 326 exhibiting the occurrence of these five combinations in each dialogue. The *Timaeus*, *Critias* and *Apology* are omitted, there being but very little conversation in them. The most striking result seems to be the following: The *Crito*, *Euthyphro*, *Protagoras*, *Charmides*, *Laches*, *Hippias*, *Euthydemus*, *Meno*, *Gorgias*, *Cratylus*, *Phaedo*, are found to be entirely without *τί μήν*?, *γε μήν*, *ἀλλὰ—μήν*. These dialogues Dittenberger groups together as constituting the first of the two main sections of Plato's works. In the second group, however, *τί μήν* and the rest are of very frequent occurrence, the dialogues being the following: *Symposium*, *Lysis*, *Phaedrus*, *Respublica*, *Theaetetus*, *Parmenides*, *Philebus*, *Sophista*, *Politicus*, *Leges*. Now as to the inferences which may be drawn from the above, Professor Dittenberger proceeds with good sense. He makes no use of his results for the purpose of determining the Platonic canon, and contents himself with suggesting that Plato's style in this particular underwent a change in the later period of his composition. In the body of the *Xenophontean* productions Dittenberger also notes a similar progression in the way *μήν* is used.

As to the chronological dividing line between the two periods of Plato's literary life, Dittenberger suggests 385 B. C. (approximately), because of the allusion in *Symp. 193a* to the *διοικισμός* of Mantinea; and conjectures that the free use of *τί μήν* is derived from Plato's first journey to the West.

A further point investigated in the present paper is the relative occurrence of *ὥσπερ* and *καθάπερ*. In the *Respublica* *ὥσπερ* occurs 212 times, *καθάπερ* but 5 times; in the *Leges* on the other hand *καθάπερ* (148) decidedly prevails over *ὥσπερ* (24). Now the dialogues resembling the *Leges* in the employment of *καθάπερ* are: The *Sophista*, *ὥσπερ* 9, *καθάπερ* 14, *Politicus* 16:34, *Philebus* 9:27, *Timaeus* 10:18, *Critias* 2:5. The use of *ὥσπερ* and of *καθαπερεῖ* corresponds. *Aristophanes* too, whose date of composition is nearer to the earlier period of Plato's writing, uses *ὥσπερ* almost exclusively.

A similar observation is made as to the use of *μέχρι* (used synonymously with *μέχρι οὗ* and *ἕως*). It occurs almost exclusively in the dialogues of Plato's later age, viz. in the *Leges*, *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Sophista*, *Politicus*, etc.

A similar note is made by Dittenberger on the pleonastic combination *τάχα ἴσως*.

The paper evidently suggests in what direction Platonic studies may now profitably be undertaken, and the results of this and similar investigations promise to be of more substantial value than classifications and combinations based mainly on material analyses.

P. Stengel writes on Greek sacrifices to the winds. They are met with from the times of the Persian wars on, and probably were copied from those of the

¹ See American Journal of Philology, III 103.

Phenician sailors. Sanctuaries are known to have existed at Athens, Sikyon, Megalopolis, Thurii. The ritual observed resembled that employed in sacrificing to the dead.

H. van Herwerden. *Homericæ*, pp. 351–379. The writer thinks that Homeric scholars nowadays observe an ultra-conservative attitude with regard to the Alexandrian arrangement of the text. While commending the recent critical labors of Nauck, he himself makes ample contributions in the present paper. Not less than 113 passages are commented upon, of which a little more than one-half are in the *Odyssey*. In a few instances his remarks confirm that which has already been established; e. g. in Θ 108 and Ψ 470 he supports the exclusion of these lines by the Alexandrians. In ι 97 he defends *λαθέσθαι* against Naber who proposed *λάθοντο*; in I 3 he maintains *βεβόληται* against Nauck; in O 680 he supports *συναείρεται* against the same editor.

In the great majority of cases, however, Herwerden attacks the established reading, having no patience with the "average critic" (p. 360, l. 8); on Π 736 "Verba pessime depravata sine suspicione legi mirarer, si nescirem nihil non aequo animo tolerare in Homero plerosque criticos."

In many cases syntactical considerations prompt the change, e. g. T 208 he substitutes *τεύξασθαι* for *τεύξεσθαι* (after *ἀνώγειν*), "nam futurum post jubendi verbum, etiam ubi iussa non statim perficienda sunt (sic enim futurum hic explicant) soloecum est." In Ω 586 he substitutes the optative for *ἀλίπηται*. In λ 10 (*τὴν δ' ἀνεμός τε κυβερνήτης τ' ἰθύνει*) he reads *ἰθύνον*: "duo subjecta non unam notionem exprimunt sed duas penitus diversas." Other syntactical remarks are made on ρ 413, ι 384 sqq., σ 452 sq.

As to etymology we glean a few points: *τραπείωμεν* (θ 292) H. derives not from *τρέπω* (*τραπῶμεν*), but from *τέρπω* per metathesis,¹ quoting the construction *ἐν φιλότῃ τραπείωμεν ἐννηθύντε* Ξ 314. Insisting on the primitive consonant which must have existed as the initial sound of *ιδέ* (*ἡδέ*), he removes the *v* movable in ι, 186, citing many passages with an apparent hiatus of a similar kind. A form "omni analogia destitutum" such as *φύξηλις* (p. 360), P 143, is to him "admodum suspectum." Regard for logical consistency and for taste suggests to him critical remarks on P 742 sqq., Σ 25 (*νεκταρέω*), Ω 649 (*ἐπικερτομέων*). A number of lines are bracketed, e. g. I 394, δ 144–146 (ε 32–40, "valde mihi suspecti sunt"), κ 415–417, ο 39, ο 201, ο 554, φ 107.

To restore the ancient form, H. favors *slight* change; of two emendations he favors that which (p. 378) "lenitate magis commendatur," and p. 367 "locum obscurum et corruptum *leni manu* sic refinxerim," etc.²

E. Maas (Florence) writes on the "List of Commentators on Aratus." There are given in Cod. Vat. 191, fol. 209^b, a number of names of Greek writers on astronomical subjects. The title, however, "*οἱ περὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ* (Aratus) *συντάξασμενοι*," is palpably erroneous, since the list given includes many authors earlier than Aratus. Maas has now discovered in Cod. Vat. Graec. 381 a very similar list with the heading "*οἱ περὶ τοῦ πᾶσι συντάξαντες*," and infers that both lists are derived from the same source, viz. a catalogue of works or authors

¹ Which had been done before by Veitch s. v. *τέρπω*, ed. 1879.

² A few misprints occur. On p. 372, l. 8 from below read *ὡς ὅτ' ε* instead of *ὡς ὅτι*; on p. 377, l. 8 from above read *cum* instead of *eum*.

referred to in some particular work on astronomy (no longer extant), and that both titles are improvised.

E. Albrecht (Berlin) publishes an exhaustive and laborious paper on "Repeated verses and parts of verses in Vergil." The main topics discussed are: I. Set phrases referring to recurrent matters. II. Lines from different books. Here we find the interesting statement (p. 407) that in the Aeneid with two exceptions (V 89, X 767) all repeated lines *in similes* are derived from the Georgics. III. Intentional repetitions. IV. Lines in the Aeneid which are less apt in one passage than in the other. A summary is given on p. 433 sqq.

In questions of genuineness Albrecht generally takes a conservative view, declining to accept the strictures of Peerlkamp and of Ribbeck. Some imperfections are referred to the incompleted condition in which Vergil left his last poem. As a rule no verse is repeated more than once, and on the whole A. remarks p. 432: "How very eager Vergil is to vary the phrasing where the subject-matter is identical"; as in describing daybreak, nightfall, the fury of the winds and of the sea, the din of battle. Of course every one will ask himself: Did Vergil try to live up to his Homeric model in this particular? One can hardly say yes. For while, as to Homeric repetition, "ratio haec (Heyne ap. Albr. p. 413) tenenda est ne semel bene et proprie enuntiata jejune aut perperam mutantur," one may well doubt whether Vergil entirely trusted his own workmanship in this point.

Th. Mommsen prints an elaborate paper entitled "Schweizer Nachstudien." While in this "aftermath" the points discussed are mainly antiquarian, they do not at all refer exclusively to ancient Helvetia. Some of the topics discussed are: that Caesar did not know the real sources of the Rhone; that none of the vanquished Helvetii were to be admitted to Roman citizenship; what the *pagus* was—two important inscriptions bearing on the question; what the *equites singulares* were—what kind of franchise they enjoyed (viz. the *jus Latinum*)—how these matters were affected by the general bestowal of the Roman franchise by Caracalla; a special office in Helvetia, viz. the "curator civium Romanorum conventus Helvetici." The real bearing of the entire inquiry is announced on p. 483, viz. to mark the fundamental difference between the Graeco-Roman and the Gallo-Germanic custom and idea of *political community*, the former attaching it entirely to a town or city, the latter treating the individual mode of habitation as entirely secondary.

Mommsen also communicates an inscription from Caiatia: "Q. Folvius Q. f. M. [N. ?] hance aqua m) indeixsit apu(t) P. Atilium L. f. pr(aetorem) urb(anum). The distinguished antiquarian suggests in explanation (assuming the date of the later republic from the form of the letters) that whoever wished to tap a public aqueduct for private uses, such as irrigation, had to notify (*indicere* here = *indicare*) the public authorities. Other minor papers are "Analecta Macrobian," by G. Wissowa; "Ueber den Vaticanus 915 des Theognis" and "Faliskisches," by H. Jordan.

No. IV.

This number, which is chiefly a Latin one, is the last issued under the editorial management of Prof. Hübner. His successors are Prof. Kaibel of Rostock and Prof. Robert of Berlin.

Professor Hübner himself contributes an elaborate article entitled *Exercitus Britannicus*, a survey of facts and data gathered from a vast number of sources. The paper well illustrates the fact that epigraphic study is assuming more and more the dignity of an independent branch of historical investigation. For while the author fully and freely refers to Caesar, Strabo, Tacitus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, his statements, inferences, and conjectures are based, in great part, upon inscriptions. His main endeavor is to trace the composition of the Roman army in Britain during the 250 years from Caesar onward to Claudius Domitian, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Septimius Severus. The legions represented in the history of the occupation were the II Augusta, XIV, IX, XX (Valeria Victrix) and the II Adjutrix, the latter taking the part of the XIV in Nero's reign.

The paper, although largely a collection of fragmentary material, strongly sets forth the vast but well-directed machinery manipulated by the imperial administration, the working of which seems to have suffered little from the succession of the emperors in the capital, whatever their character may have been. The *auxilia* of the legions are described as fully as the legions themselves; and these lists show how skilfully Rome availed herself of military forces drawn from one province to maintain her grasp upon another. While most of the cavalry were from Gaul (9 alae), Germania (*i. e.* the *provinces* so-called) furnished a heavy contingent of cohorts (20 or 21) of various tribes, particularly of the Nervii and Batavi. Other *auxilia* were drawn from the province of Pannonia (from Illyricum, Delmatia, Thracia) and from Hispania. Among such bodies of troops from the provinces certain ones are designated *en bloc* as Roman citizens; *e. g.* "cohors secunda Vasconum c(ivium) R(omanorum)," "cohors prima fida Vardullorum civium Romanorum," "ala Hispanorum Vettonum civium Romanorum."

G. Knaack of Stettin presents *Studien zu Hygin* (the compiler of mythological legends and fables). By copious quotations from Cassiodorus' *Variae* he tries to make out not merely that Cassiodorus freely transcribed from Hyginus, but that Hyginus, in the form or edition used by Cassiodorus, was very much more copious than he is now found to be in the existing text, which Knaack also shows to be very corrupt. He suggests a number of corrections, and points out the way to further emendations. Some of the writer's inferences are somewhat positive; *e. g.* p. 589: "Cassiodor hat also mehr *inventores* als Hygin. Dieses Plus kann aber nicht aus einer nebenher benutzten Quelle geflossen sein, da es eng verknüpft mit dem aus Hygin bekannten auftritt und denselben einheitlichen Charakter traegt." The italics are ours. On the next page we read: "Da Cassiodor . . . die Angabe *nach meiner Ausführung allein dem Hyginus verdankt*, so muss," etc., *i. e.* a conjecture is made the premise of a categorical conclusion.

Professor Mommsen in this number prints a paper on the *Geographical passages in Ammianus*. As he sums up the points of this paper himself in his own way and in his own vein, it may be best simply to reproduce his own statement, for even in this brief summary Mommsen's acuteness and pungency and the almost personal liveliness of his criticism are fully exhibited: What Gardthausen says is true that the geographical sections in Ammianus are elaborated after the

fashion of a schedule (*schematisch*); nay we may confidently add that it probably was the intention of the historian to insert in his work, at the proper places, a description of the entire inhabited world. But the 'schematic' geography which Gardthausen's hypothesis represents to have been the basis of Ammianus' work, never existed. Ammianus rather took for such a basis (so far as the Roman empire was concerned) the *official lists* of towns and districts, and, for foreign countries, he availed himself of the analogous lists of Ptolemy, adding from the historical work of Festus (which was arranged according to countries) the historical notices, and from the memorabilia of Pliny and of Solinus other points of curious interest. Moreover, he occasionally made use of Greek topographical descriptions in special sections. And it is to the influence of the source last named that the occasional abandonment by Ammianus himself of his own scheme is to be ascribed. Lastly, we find many statements of fact of special character which have been borrowed from others, as may be proved in the case of Caesar, Sallust, and Livy. While, therefore, the plan of his work gives evidence of reflexion and reading, Ammianus exhibits not only great carelessness in the execution, but also an attempt to cover up his lack of knowledge with empty words, and to parade before the reader at every point and on every subject an appearance of accurate information, which on careful scrutiny turns out to be nothing else than an audacious and inadequate cloak for his own ignorance. The vain endeavor to attain omniscience, as it is the curse of all encyclopedic culture, and as it pre-eminently was the curse of those unhappy generations who, even in the domain of intellectual effort, were making their beggarly haunt upon the ruins of a greater past, shows itself in Ammianus, not in this department alone. His other *excursus* on the oracles and other religious ideas of various sorts, on rainbows, comets, eclipses, intercalation, earthquakes, cultivation of palm trees, hieroglyphics, each darkens by its inadequacy what was dark enough before. And to all of this is to be added the ostentatious arrogance of the Greek, which led him to use, instead of his own tongue, the proud language of the court and empire, a language which he never was able to handle easily in spite of his close attention to phraseology. At the same time, Ammianus in his own proper sphere remains what he was to us, a man of sound principles, of liberal and elevated sentiments, having an insight into the human heart which, keen and yet tender, was better calculated to see through the baseness of courtiers than to identify himself in thought with the individuality of alien peoples. Still with all his faults and shortcomings he is by far the best historian of an epoch in general history which was indeed profoundly debased, but is notwithstanding of the greatest importance.

A corollary follows, viz. that it is desirable to have an edition of Ammianus in which the source of each geographical statement is noted, a work which properly should be done in a collection of *Geographi Latini Minores*. Thus wheat and chaff might be separated, for Mommsen says "The investigation which I have made in the present paper has shown to me in an alarming manner the misuse in geographical manuals of data furnished by Ammianus."

E. G. SIHLER.